

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

MAR 03 2009

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

IMELDA SOELIMTO,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 05-71905

Agency No. A096-053-956

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted February 18, 2009**

Before: BEEZER, FERNANDEZ, and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges.

Imelda Soelimto, a native and citizen of Indonesia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying her application for asylum, withholding of

KAD/Research 05-71905

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence, *Nagoulko* v. *INS*, 333 F.3d 1012, 1015 (9th Cir. 2003), and we deny the petition for review.

The BIA denied Soelimto's asylum application as time barred. Soelimto does not challenge this finding.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA's finding that Soelimto's cumulative experiences do not rise to the level of past persecution. *See id.* at 1016-18. In addition, even if the disfavored group analysis set forth in *Sael v. Ashcroft*, 386 F.3d 922, 927-29 (9th Cir. 2004) applies in the context of withholding of removal, Soelimto failed to establish that it was more likely than not that she will be persecuted if she returns to Indonesia. *See Hoxha v. Ashcroft*, 319 F.3d 1179, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2003).

Substantial evidence also supports the BIA's determination that Soelimto is not entitled to CAT relief because she failed to establish that it is more likely than not that she will be tortured if she returns to Indonesia. *See Malhi v. INS*, 336 F.3d 989, 993 (9th Cir. 2003).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.